

Date: Sat, 15 Oct 94 04:30:06 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: List  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #491  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Sat, 15 Oct 94                      Volume 94 : Issue    491

Today's Topics:

                    CW QSO Content  
                    Get Over It  
                    Transmitter Sale to N

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: Thu, 13 Oct 1994 08:12:00 GMT  
From: nils.stacey@infoway.com (Niles Stacey)  
Subject: CW QSO Content

GB>Path: miwok!nbn!sgiblab!pacbell.com!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.an  
GB>From: gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown)  
GB>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy  
GB>Subject: Re: CW QSO Content  
GB>Date: 12 Oct 1994 07:37:28 GMT  
GB>Organization: University of Nebraska--Lincoln  
GB>Lines: 29  
GB>Distribution: world  
GB>Message-ID: <37g3no\$714@crcnis1.unl.edu>  
GB>References: <Cwynvq.Ezx@cruzio.com> <CxAGw6.BIE@news.hawaii.edu> <37c5ak\$4mp  
GB>NNTP-Posting-Host: unlinfo2.unl.edu  
GB>X-Newsreader: TIN [version 1.2 PL2]

GB>Cecil\_A\_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com wrote:  
GB>: In article <37dapa\$ksr@sugar.neosoft.com>,  
GB>: Dr. Michael Mancini <mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> wrote:

GB>: >You know, I have friends who are trying to get their college degrees,  
GB>: >and the years go by and they never get them.

GB>: Maybe you missed the point. We are not talking about qualifications. We  
GB>: are talking about arbitrary governmental regulations. A person not wishing  
GB>: to take a foreign language in college can find one that doesn't require it  
GB>: for a degree. High speed CW testing is to HF amateur radio as a foreign  
GB>: language is to a BSEE degree.

GB>: --

GB>: 73, Cecil, KG7BK, OOTC (All my own personal fuzzy logic, not Intel's)

GB>BZZZZZZZZT...wrong answer, Cecil. I just love these attempts at  
GB>meaningful analogies! Arguments would be alot stronger without them.

GB>Even by Dan's figure, 38% of US amateurs regularly use CW. I'd dare  
GB>say the figure for International hams (on HF) is quite a bit higher.  
GB>Now, if 38% + of all the electrical engineering literature was  
GB>published in another language, you can bet your rubber sea-serpent  
GB>that they would require foreign language for a BSEE.

GB>Care to try another anal-alology?

>>GB>Greg<< ...is my middle name~! I still think we could somewhere  
with this conversation.

N6ZVZ

---

\* SLMR 2.1a \* Humility is no excuse for a good personality.

-----

Date: Thu, 13 Oct 1994 08:11:00 GMT  
From: nils.stacey@infoway.com (Niles Stacey)  
Subject: Get Over It

DP>Path: miwok!well!pacbell.com!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!swi  
DP>From: dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)  
DP>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy  
DP>Subject: Re: Get Over It  
DP>Message-ID: <101294025647Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>  
DP>Date: Wed, 12 Oct 1994 02:56:00 EST  
DP>References: <37ctce\$drb@crcnis1.unl.edu>  
DP>Organization: American Computer Experts, Cleveland, Ohio USA  
DP>X-Newsreader: Rnf 0.78

DP>Lines: 24

DP>gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown) writes:

DP>>No, we shouldn't, Ed. Nor should we drop any of the requirements.  
DP>>The point I was making (through absurdism) is basically that you can  
DP>>use the "I'm not gonna use it so why should I know it" argument

I couldn't disagree more. How does one possibly know that one is "...not  
gonna use it..."?!!!! I could never figure that out. What if...I know,  
however, what if you had NO other means of communication? Would you  
simply not communicate or would you use CW?

DP>>against almost (\_almost\_) every question on the test...doesn't mean  
DP>>it's right. We as amateurs have the privilege of operating \_any\_ of  
DP>>the modes/freqs available to our license class. And we are expected  
DP>>to know what we need to know to do all this safely. The lowest  
DP>>"common" denominator is too low and defeats the purpose of the  
DP>>service.

Not just safely...

DP>Exactly and any question involving rules or procedures for ensuring  
DP>compliance along with safety are valid questions. Having mode exclusive  
DP>test on a pass/fail basis sets that single mode aside from all the rest.  
DP>So either that mode has properties that so drastically set it aside from  
DP>other modes or it is time to reconsider the pass/fail status of the mode  
DP>specific testing.

...and again! Not just safely...

Also, in answer to the other claims that CW is not a language! That's  
not a very valid claim either. It depends on what you translate cw  
toward. If English is the translation, that's ok. If any other  
translation is worth the effort, that's ok as well. I know what you're  
thinking, English is the established protocol for CW, ok....so what.  
Mathematics is the established norm for all speci in any language. That  
is what we hope to find as a relative focal point to communicate with  
civilizations that we are as of yet unaware.

The best evidence that I have personally encountered through CW is that  
it is an ARTFORM as well as a very reliable form of conveying messages  
from on station to another!

best of 7 3 -- N6ZVZ

---

\* SLMR 2.1a \* Infinity is a self-extracting thought form.

-----  
Date: Fri, 14 Oct 94 11:19:14 -0500  
From: Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com>  
Subject: Transmitter Sale to N

Niles Stacey <niles.stacey@infoway.com> writes:

> \* SLMR 2.1a \* Polaroids: what polar bears get from sitting on icecaps

I'm sorely tempted to go post that one in rec.photo -- oughta start a flame war that would keep Prudhoe Bay warm this winter...

-----  
Date: Fri, 14 Oct 94 11:22:53 -0500  
From: Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com>

References<37irpl\$cg0@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> <1994Oct13.142836.22507@lpi.liant.com>,  
<37kfob\$4k@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>  
Subject: Re: ARRL ROANOKE DIV. ELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Dr. Michael Mancini <mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> writes:

>Perhaps we would. The League looks out for the interests of the League.  
>Period. When I got into this game back in the mid-Seventies, ARRL membership  
>(with QST) was \$7.50 a year. Now (last I heard) it is \$30.00.

\$30,000 will buy you a nice, new Buick Park Avenue. How much did an Electra 225 cost when you got into this game? \$7,500 perhaps?

-----  
Date: Fri, 14 Oct 94 11:15:15 -0500  
From: Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com>

References<37fe31\$7j0@newsbf01.news.aol.com> <37flqb\$es1@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,  
<101394000133Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>  
Subject: Re: The code debate....my view

Dan Pickersgill <dan@amcomp.com> writes:

>Where in part 97 did it say one must "put forth reasonable effort" to  
>obtain a ham license?

Or in the Communications Act of 1934? Or in the Constitution?

-- Ed Ellers, KD4AWQ

-----  
Date: Fri, 14 Oct 1994 14:40:19 GMT  
From: barron@rmc.liant.com (Robert Barron)

References<37irpl\$cg0@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> <1994Oct13.142836.22507@lpi.liant.com>,  
<37kfob\$4k@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>  
Reply-To: barron@rmc.liant.com  
Subject: Re: ARRL ROANOKE DIV. ELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

In <37kfob\$4k@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini) writes:

>Perhaps we would. The League looks out for the interests of the League.  
>Period. When I got into this game back in the mid-Seventies, ARRL membership  
>(with QST) was \$7.50 a year. Now (last I heard) it is \$30.00.

In the mid-Seventies pay phone calls in Louisiana were 5 cents, now they're 25 cents. The ARRL is NOT responsible for inflation. The ARRL's costs rise along with everyone else's.

>The Leagues stands on critical issues such as the Codeless Technician have  
>been a scam. They pushed for "all Amateur privileges 222 MHz and above"  
>and in reality we wound up with "all Amateur Privileges 30 MHz and above."  
>Who's deceived who here? Originally, the proposal would have populated  
>some of our lesser-used bands in the VHF, UHF, and microwave spectrum,  
>which would have appealed to the individuals to which this new class of  
>license was initially created for (technical, academic types who are  
>pushing the state-of-the-art in digital, spread-spectrum, and computer-  
>enhanced wireless communications). Now, what we have is primarily  
>CB-types, who have flocked to Two Meters in droves, exactly according  
>to my predictions. The only difference is now, instead of 40 channels  
>to play with, they have HUNDREDS.

The ARRL proposed to the FCC a new license with 222 MHz and above privileges, based on membership interest (perceived or not). The FCC accepts public comments and eventually modifies the proposal or replaces it with one supplied by the QCWA. How has the ARRL deceived us in this matter? It would seem to me that they proposed what you think is a good idea but the QCWA and FCC thought otherwise.

>The League has welcomed these "new" amateurs with open arms. And why not?  
>At \$30 a head, they represent some serious cash flow. Even though the  
>League is a non-profit organization, most of the officers at Newington  
>still draw handsome salaries.

The League had better welcome new Amateurs with open arms! You're

saying that they should be given the cold shoulder? Make no sense at all! Considering the cost of living in CT no HQ staffers are getting rich. Have you seen the job postings? Barely over \$20,000 a year and that's living in one of the most expensive areas of the country!

>The days of Hiram Percy Maxim are long gone.

That's true. For better or worse.

73,

Robert KA5WSS  
barron@rmc.liant.com

-----  
Date: 14 Oct 1994 16:55:10 GMT  
From: Cecil\_A\_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com

References<37g3no\$714@crcnis1.unl.edu> <37h27k\$8oc@chnews.intel.com>,  
<37l42q\$hu7@crcnis1.unl.edu>  
Subject: Re: CW QSO Content

In article <37l42q\$hu7@crcnis1.unl.edu>,  
gregory brown <gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu> wrote:

>...I was laughing at your analogy.

You didn't seem to understand the analogy. The analogy was...

being coerced to endure something of no value on the way to acquiring something of value. CW is of no value to approximately half the hams on HF who never use it after they pass their general/advanced tests. It just sits there, like an unused TSR, accomplishing no useful purpose.

--

73, Cecil, KG7BK, 00TC (All my own personal fuzzy logic, not Intel's)

-----  
Date: 15 Oct 1994 01:39:37 GMT  
From: Cecil\_A\_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com

References<37g3no\$714@crcnis1.unl.edu> <37h27k\$8oc@chnews.intel.com>,  
<CxoFI2.E3z@news.hawaii.edu>  
Subject: Re: CW QSO Content

In article <CxoFI2.E3z@news.hawaii.edu>,  
Jeffrey Herman <jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu> wrote:

>

>How did you interpret that, Cec? That's \*not\* what Greg said.

Hi Jeff, I \_asked a question\_ to see if that was what he really meant.

>So you are agreeing that 38% (more like 50%) is not an insignificant  
>figure?

Now that you ask... I think the 50% of HF hams that do not use CW is  
rather a significant figure.

>If 38% of all hams (better: about 50% of HF comms) use CW then that  
>seems like a good reason to require a knowledge of CW;

Then are you saying that the 50% of HF hams who use CW are more important  
than the 50% who don't use CW? Why should half the HF ham population be  
hazed so the other half can feel good?

--

73, Cecil, KG7BK, 00TC (All my own personal fuzzy logic, not Intel's)

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #491

\*\*\*\*\*